

REMARKS

Claims 50, 52-58, and 60-91 are pending, with claims 50, 58, 66, 70, and 71 being independent. Claims 51 and 59 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 50, 52-58, and 60-71 have been amended and claims 72-91 have been added.

Allowable Subject Matter

Initially, Applicants thank Examiner Shingles for the indication that claims 66-71 are allowed and that dependent claims 51 and 59 recite allowable subject matter. In the above amendments, Applicants have removed limitations of independent claims 66, 70, and 71. Applicants submit that the removed limitations are unnecessary for the patentability of those claims and, therefore, the amendments do not impact the allowability of claims 66-71.

Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Shingles for the thoughtful courtesies and kind treatment afforded during the interview conducted on February 12, 2009. During the interview, Examiner Shingles and Applicants' representative discussed an amended version of independent claim 50. Examiner Shingles indicated that the discussed version of independent claim 50 included allowable features of claim 51 and that the discussed version of independent claim 50 would be allowable if presented in a formal response. In the above amendments, Applicants have made relatively minor changes to the "receiving" limitation of the discussed version of independent claim 50. Applicants submit that the changes merely remove unnecessary limitations from the discussed version of independent claim 50 and do not impact the incorporation of allowable features of claim 51 into independent claim 50. This reply reflects the substance of the interview.

§ 112 Rejections

Claims 54 and 62, which depend from claims 50 and 58, respectively, were rejected for failing to limit their preceding parent claims. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 50 and 58 address all of the issues raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

§ 102 and § 103 Rejections

Claims 50, 52-55, 58, and 60-63 were rejected as being anticipated by Olnowich (U.S. Patent No. 5,444,705), and claims 56, 57, 64, and 65 were rejected as being unpatentable over Olnowich in view of Juels (U.S. Patent No. 7,197,639). Applicants traverse these rejections, and yet, to expedite prosecution, have amended independent claims 50 and 58 to obviate the rejections. Specifically, claim 51 was indicated as reciting allowable subject matter and only objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. Applicants have cancelled claim 51 and amended claim 50 to include features of claim 51. As discussed in the interview of February 12, 2009, Applicants submit that the features of claim 51 added to claim 50 include allowable features of claim 51, even though the amendments to claim 50 do not maintain claim 51 in its prior form. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent claim 50 and its dependent claims.

Independent claim 58, although different in scope from claim 50, recites features similar to independent claim 50, but does so in the context of a networking device. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 50, Applicants submit that independent claim 58 and its dependent claims are allowable.

New Claims

New claims 72-91 each depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 50, independent claim 58, independent claim 66, independent claim 70, or independent claim 71. At least for the reason of that dependency and the reasons noted above, Applicants submit that new claims 72-91 are allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the

Applicant : Christopher J. Wright et al.
Serial No. : 10/698,933
Filed : November 3, 2003
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 24838-0002002 / Security 05-
CON

amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, Applicants hereby petition that the period for response be extended for one month to and including March 18, 2009.

The fee in the amount of \$1066.00 in payment of the excess claims fee (\$936) and the one-month extension of time fee (\$130) is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2009

/Jeremy J. Monaldo/
Jeremy J. Monaldo
Reg. No. 58,680

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331